

Appl. No. 10/764,931
Atty. Docket No. CM2491D
Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-2 and 6-10 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 3-5 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 2 has been amended to further characterize the hard surface cleaning composition comprising an organic solvent system comprising an organoamine solvent and a cyclodextrin malodor-control agent . Support for the amendment is found at page 6, lines 11-17 and page 15, lines 8-25 of the specification.

Claim 6 has also been rewritten to more specifically characterize the method further having the step of covering the cookware/tableware with cling film for a time sufficient to promote swelling of the soil prior to manual or automatic dishwashing. Support for this amendment is found at page 17, line 22 – page 18, line 2 of the specification.

In addition, new Claims 7-12 have been added. Support for these claims are found at the following locations of the specification.

Claim 7 – pg 17, lines 7-11 and page 17, line 22 – page 18, line 2.

Claim 8 - page 6, lines 19-27; page 7, lines 5-11.

Claim 9 – page 7, lines 5-6.

Claim 10 – page 7, lines 9-11.

Claim 11 – page 6, line 29 – page 7, line 3 and page 17, lines 24-27.

Claim 12 – page 4, lines 22-28 and page 17, lines 24-27.

Claim 1 has been withdrawn as a result of an earlier restriction requirement.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/764,931
 Atty. Docket No. CM2491D
 Amdt. dated January 25, 2006
 Reply to Office Action of October 28, 2005
 Customer No. 27752

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over US 2002/0010106 (Uchiyama et al.)

Claims 2-6 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchiyama et al.. Uchiyama et al. does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness because it does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of Claim 2 and claims dependent thereon (see MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, Uchiyama et al. does not discuss or teach the use of an organoamine solvent in combination with a cyclodextrin malodor-control agent. Rather, Uchiyama et al. briefly discusses very low molecular weight amines as not complexing effectively with cyclodextrin in the context of being "unwanted molecules". Paragraph [0018].

As such, Applicants request that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a). Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested. Applicants' attorney invites the Examiner to contact her at any time with any issue that may arise.

This response represents an earnest effort to place the application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 1-2 and 6-12 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By _____

Signature

Laura R. Grunzinger

Typed or Printed Name

Registration No. 47,616

(513) 627-4597

Date: January 25, 2006
 Customer No. 27752